

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/802,883	YOSHIDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thao T. Tran	1711	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thao T. Tran. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Alan Kasper. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Skinner '793 and Grube '052.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants will amend the claims to overcome the 112 issues. Applicants proposed amendments to the claims, but the examiner noted that these are not specific enough with regard to the range of additives. Also, with regard to the softness of the material in the cleaning layer, the parameters and more composition may need to be specified, for example the acrylic polymer in the composition. And further with regard to thickness of the cleaning layer, a specific range may need to be recited. And finally, an inconsistency was noted with regard to the description of the Tables.